

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

JOHN DOE,

Case No. 25-sc-1343 (LMP/LIB)

Plaintiff,

v.

CRISTINEL COCONCEA, BETH
ISRAEL DEACONNESS MEDICAL
CENTER, and JOHNSON &
JOHNSON, INC.,

**ORDER DENYING
MOTION TO SEAL AND
DISMISSING COMPLAINT**

Defendants.

Plaintiff, who does not identify himself, filed this lawsuit alleging that Defendants Cristinel Coconcea and Beth Israel Deaconness Medical Center committed medical malpractice when treating him for a medical condition by prescribing and administering an excessive dosage of a drug manufactured by Defendant Johnson & Johnson, Inc. *See* ECF No. 1. Rather than pay the associated filing fee, Plaintiff applied to proceed *in forma pauperis* (“IFP”)—that is, without prepaying fees and costs. ECF No. 2. In addition, Plaintiff filed a motion asking the Court to seal this case, claiming that the case should be sealed because it involves confidential medical records. ECF No. 3 at 2. If the Court is not inclined to seal the case, Plaintiff asks the Court to “close the case” and “not file it.” *Id.*

United States Magistrate Judge Leo I. Brisbois entered an order on April 17, 2025 (the “April 17 Order”), explaining that it is not appropriate to seal this entire matter. *See generally* ECF No. 4. In light of Plaintiff’s request to “close the case” if it is not sealed, Magistrate Judge Brisbois ordered Plaintiff to file a formal notice of voluntary dismissal by May 8, 2025. *Id.* at 2–3. If Plaintiff did not do so, his motion to seal would be denied and the case would be made public. *Id.* However, all mail sent by the Clerk of Court to the address Plaintiff provided, including a copy of the April 17 Order, has been returned as undeliverable with no forwarding address available. Plaintiff has not contacted the Court with updated mailing information and, indeed, has not communicated with the Court for any other reason since initiating this action.

Nevertheless, the April 17 Order’s deadline has passed, and this matter is now before this Court. For the reasons thoroughly explained in the April 17 Order, it is not appropriate for this case to remain sealed. *See id.* at 1–3. Therefore, in accordance with Plaintiff’s request to dismiss this case if it were to be unsealed, the Court dismisses this case without prejudice pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(a)(2).

ORDER

Based on the foregoing, and on all the files, records, and proceedings in this matter, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that:

1. Plaintiff’s Motion to Seal (ECF No. 3) is **DENIED** and the case shall be unsealed with the complaint remaining under seal;
2. This matter shall be unsealed with the exception of the Complaint (ECF No. 1), which shall remain under seal;

3. Plaintiff's Complaint (ECF No. 1) is **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**; and

4. Plaintiff's IFP Application (ECF No. 2) is **DENIED AS MOOT**.

LET JUDGMENT BE ENTERED ACCORDINGLY.

Dated: May 30, 2025

s/Laura M. Provinzino

Laura M. Provinzino
United States District Judge